United Nations A/C.5/66/SR.27

General Assembly
Sixty-sixth session

Official Reco

Distr.: General
4 May 2012

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 27th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 6 March 2012, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Tommo Monthe ..... (Cameroon)
Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. Kelapile

Contents

Agenda item 134: Programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 (*continued*)

Comprehensive review of the pension schemes for the members of the International Court of Justice and judges of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda

Conclusions of the High-level Working Group on Programme Criticality

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

12-25292 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda item 134: Programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 (*continued*)

Comprehensive review of the pension schemes for the members of the International Court of Justice and judges of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (A/66/617 and A/66/709)

1. **Ms. Lopez** (Office of Human Resources Management), introducing the report of the Secretary-General on the comprehensive review of the pension schemes for the members of the International Court of Justice and judges of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (A/66/617), recalled that, by its resolution 65/258, the General Assembly had decided that the pension schemes for members of the Court and for the judges of the two Tribunals should be reviewed at its sixty-sixth session. The report of the Secretary-General provided background information on the evolution of the pension benefits over time, analysed the current retirement benefits scheme and described the implementation of the comprehensive review; it also presented various pension benefit design options and offered a final recommendation, including financial implications.

2. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 63/259, the Secretary-General had enlisted the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund to undertake a comprehensive review of the retirement pensions. Given the large scope of the review, actuaries had been contracted to provide expertise not available at the Fund, and a working group made up of representatives of the Office of Human Resources Management, the Court and the Tribunals had been established and coordinated by the Fund.

3. Currently, 35 judges were serving at the Court and the two Tribunals and 61 retired judges were receiving pension benefits; ad litem judges had not been included as they were not entitled to periodic retirement benefits. Under the existing retirement benefit scheme, a retiring judge who had completed a nine-year term of office received benefits representing a replacement ratio of approximately 50 per cent of his or her final salary at age 60. The pension benefits were not pre-funded.

4. Four possible design options had been proposed in the light of the comprehensive review. The first was a defined-benefit scheme that provided a periodic benefit, guaranteed for the life of the participant. The second was a defined-contribution scheme that provided an account balance based on the actual earnings of underlying investments. The third option was to make a cash lump-sum payment in lieu of a pension through hybrid defined-benefit and defined-contribution schemes. The fourth option was to maintain the current pension benefit scheme. The first three options, which were used in the public and private sectors, were analysed in the report in the administrative context of the Court and the two Tribunals.

5. The Secretary-General recommended the defined-benefit scheme as the appropriate option for the retirement benefits of new members of the Court and judges of the two Tribunals. The most favoured application of that option would be to change the current two-tiered system of accumulation to a linear system of accumulation of 3.7 per cent per year for 18 years and nothing thereafter. That approach would significantly reduce the estimated liability for new judges projected to assume office over the next 30 years, from $29,835,105 to $19,870,180, representing a reduction of $9,964,925. Under Article 32, paragraph 5, of the Court's Statute, the salaries, allowances and compensation of the members of the Court could not be decreased during a member's term of office; it was therefore suggested that any new scheme should apply only to newly elected members of the Court. The same would apply in respect of judges of the two Tribunals, whose statutes provided for the same conditions of service.

6. The Court had expressed concerns regarding the redesign of the pension benefit scheme. In particular, it believed that the proposed linear system of accumulation would encourage members of the Court to stand for re-election, which could have adverse consequences for the rotation of the bench. The Court's additional concerns were noted in paragraph 54 of the report.

7. **Mr. Kelapile** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/66/709), said that the Advisory Committee had considered the relative merits and possible disadvantages of the four pension benefit design options set out in the Secretary-General's report. For purposes of comparison, the Advisory Committee had requested information on the retirement benefits payable to other Secretariat and non-Secretariat officials and to the judges of the International Criminal Court.

8. The Advisory Committee noted the Secretary-General's recommendation of the defined-benefit scheme, which would be based on a linear rather than a two-tiered system of accumulation, as the most appropriate way forward. Should the General Assembly endorse the Secretary-General's recommendation, the estimated liability for new judges projected to assume office over the next 30 years would be reduced by some $9.96 million. In addition, changing to a linear system of accumulation would reduce the actuarial cost of funding the pension entitlement over a 10-year period from its current level of about 66 per cent of the judges' base pay to about 44 per cent.

9. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 65/258, the Advisory Committee had considered the question of acquired pension benefit rights. According to the Secretary-General, the implementation of a pension scheme designed to take into consideration the prior employment of the members of the Court and the judges of the Tribunals could face legal and practical difficulties. However, the Advisory Committee had been informed that the proposed defined-benefit pension scheme included an adjusted accrual rate intended to reflect the possibility that the individuals concerned had had previous careers and had acquired pension benefit rights. More detailed information on the issue was contained in paragraphs 25 to 28 of the Advisory Committee's report.

10. The Advisory Committee recommended that the General Assembly should endorse the Secretary-General's recommendation for a defined-benefit pension scheme with a linear system of accumulation of 3.7 per cent for 18 years. It also supported the Secretary-General's suggestion that the new arrangements should apply only to new members of the Court and judges of the Tribunals, if any. Since the question of acquired pension benefit rights should have been addressed in more detail in the Secretary-General's report, the General Assembly might wish to request the Secretary-General to give further consideration to the issue and to report back to the Assembly at its sixty-eighth session in the context of the next comprehensive review of pension schemes.

11. **Mr. Mihoubi** (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the members of the International Court of Justice and the judges of the Tribunals should receive a compensation package commensurate with their high status and responsibilities. The Group supported the principle, enshrined in the Statute of the Court and the statutes of the Tribunals, that the judges' salaries and allowances should be fixed by the General Assembly and should not be decreased during the term of office. The Group also believed in the principle of equity between the benefits offered to the judges of the Tribunals and those offered to members of the International Court of Justice.

12. Recalling paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 63/259, he welcomed the Secretary-General's efforts to utilize the expertise available with the United Nations system by means of working group consultations between the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund, the Office of Human Resources Management, the Court and the Tribunals. Any pension scheme offered should provide adequate after-service benefits to judges having met the eligibility criteria relating to retirement age and period of service, based on the premise that the pension benefit served as replacement income to maintain a standard of living.

13. The Group stood ready to discuss the various pension benefit design options, bearing in mind the need to respect the Statute of the Court and the statutes of the Tribunals and to provide a pension scheme that remained non-contributory, was determined by the number of years of service and supported the rigorous standards, impartiality and independence required during the judges' tenure. Any outcome should enhance the performance of the Court and its judges instead of undermining it through a decrease in pension benefits. Lastly, he emphasized that the outcome of the discussions on the pension scheme for the members of the Court and the judges of the Tribunals would not constitute a precedent for any other category of judges working within the United Nations system.

Conclusions of the High-level Working Group on Programme Criticality (A/66/680 and A/66/720)

14. **Mr. Starr** (Under-Secretary-General for Safety and Security), introducing the report of the Secretary-General on the conclusions of the High-level Working Group on Programme Criticality (A/66/680), said that the report had been prepared pursuant to General Assembly resolution 65/259. In 2009, the Chief Executives Board for Coordination had embraced an approach to security that sought to balance security risks with programme implementation, on the premise that security efforts should facilitate the conduct of United Nations activities. That required a systematic

approach to determining programme opportunities, particularly for high-risk activities.

15. Over the years, the United Nations had been accused both of being too risk-averse and of placing personnel at unnecessary risk. In response to those concerns, and recognizing that the Organization was required to deliver results under difficult security conditions, the High-level Working Group on Programme Criticality had developed tools to better balance security risk and opportunity by ensuring that United Nations personnel did not take unnecessary risks and that those who remained in-country focused on the highest-priority activities.

16. The tools consisted of a programme criticality framework and methodology that had been developed under the leadership of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) through extensive consultations with a broad spectrum of staff of the Secretariat and United Nations agencies, funds and programmes. While the Department of Safety and Security had been involved in the process, implementation of the tools was intended to be a programme-led effort carried out at the country level by the collective United Nations presence on the ground.

17. **Mr. Kelapile** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/66/720), noted that the Secretary-General's report was an interim update on the Working Group's activities and did not contain its final conclusions, which had not yet been issued.

18. Since its establishment, the Working Group had developed a programme criticality framework, which consisted of a methodology and a supporting electronic tool for decision-making, and had proposed an implementation plan. The methodology and tool had been field-tested by United Nations country teams in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Kenya and Somalia.

19. In September 2011, the High-level Committee on Management had approved the programme criticality methodology and tool as a framework for decision-making within the guidelines for acceptable risk and had recommended that it should be rolled out in at least 12 countries by April 2013. The indicative budget for phase one of the roll-out, including training, was estimated at $595,500. The Advisory Committee had been informed that, for reasons of efficiency and timeliness, those requirements would be met from extrabudgetary funds. Pending the receipt of voluntary contributions, the humanitarian agencies and the Department of Safety and Security had each agreed to contribute $10,000 to initiate the roll-out.

20. Since work on the programme criticality framework was still at an interim stage, the Advisory Committee had no objection to the use of extrabudgetary resources to fund the initial 12-country roll-out. However, in situations where lives could be at risk, the United Nations had an obligation to ensure that predictable funding would be available for ongoing initiatives designed to protect personnel. The Advisory Committee therefore recommended that, once the framework was finalized, consideration should be given to establishing appropriate cost-sharing arrangements for a full roll-out that reflected the system-wide nature of the initiative and were similar to those used in respect of other jointly financed activities in the United Nations system.

21. He recommended that the General Assembly should take note of the report of the Secretary-General, bearing in mind the comments and recommendations of the Advisory Committee, and on the understanding that an additional report containing the final conclusions of the Working Group would be submitted once the Group had reported to the High-level Committee on Management in 2013.

22. **Mr. Mihoubi** (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the safety and security of United Nations staff, operations and premises at Headquarters and all main duty stations and in the field was of critical importance. The Group would continue to support measures for ensuring a coherent, effective, accountable and timely response to security-related threats and other emergencies. Developing a comprehensive and integrated approach to the issue of safety and security was a matter of priority.

23. Recalling the principle that the primary responsibility for ensuring the safety and security of United Nations staff and premises rested with the host countries, he stressed that provisions for safety and security could not succeed unless Member States were duly consulted. Standards had been established for other major activities of the United Nations but were still lacking in the field of safety and security. It was therefore imperative to establish clear criteria for determining security needs, evaluating threats and assessing risks in different locations and areas of

activity so as to enable the Department of Safety and Security to respond to any emergency.

24. The Group was concerned that the Secretary-General had not yet reported on the development of a comprehensive safety and security policy framework at the United Nations that would provide guidelines for threat and risk assessment, cooperation with host countries, cost-sharing arrangements and operations of the Department of Safety and Security, as requested by the General Assembly in its resolution 61/263. The Group would welcome some clarification in that regard and would also be requesting additional details concerning the phases, benchmarks and timelines of the programme criticality framework and the programme criticality levels of specific activities, including lines of accountability and a clear chain of command for all staff involved in security in the field and at duty stations.

25. **Mr. Starr** (Under-Secretary-General for Safety and Security) said that the requested report would be provided and that the comments made by the representative of Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77 and China would be addressed during the informal consultations.

The meeting rose at 10.50 a.m.

United Nations A/C.5/66/SR.28

General Assembly
Sixty-sixth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
25 May 2012

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 28th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 13 March 2012, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Tommo Monthe ..... (Cameroon)
Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. Kelapile

Contents

Agenda item 132: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Accountability

Selection and appointment of senior managers in the United Nations Secretariat

Enterprise risk management

Farewell to the Under-Secretary-General for Management

Agenda item 115: Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (*continued*)

(b) Appointment of members of the Committee on Contributions (*continued*)

(l) Appointment of members of the International Civil Service Commission

Other matters

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

12-26438 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda item 132: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Accountability (A/66/692, A/66/710 and Add.1 and A/66/738)

Selection and appointment of senior managers in the United Nations Secretariat (A/66/380 and Add.1)

Enterprise risk management (A/65/788 and Add.1)

1. **Ms. Kane** (Under-Secretary-General for Management), introducing the report of the Secretary-General on progress towards an accountability system in the United Nations Secretariat (A/66/692), said that the report highlighted the progress made in the previous two years to strengthen accountability. The Secretariat had launched a website dedicated to the topic as part of a communications campaign to promote a culture of accountability among staff at all levels. It had reviewed the delegations of authority for human resources, financial and property management to establish who had the authority to take specific decisions and actions and identify the legal source of such authority. A human resources management scorecard had been introduced to deliver timely performance information to managers and other stakeholders and was now part of the senior managers' compact. The performance appraisal system had been reformed to strengthen managerial accountability and shift the focus from compliance to advisory support, with an emphasis on career and staff development. In addition, a policy for the Secretariat-wide implementation of enterprise risk management had been promulgated and tested.

2. Progress had been made in strengthening the processes which ensured that the recommendations of the oversight bodies were implemented. The roles of the responsible officials had been clearly defined and the Management Committee monitored implementation more proactively. Fully 81 per cent of the 16,694 recommendations issued by the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) between 1999 and 2011 had been implemented and only 8 per cent were outstanding. The Secretariat had a similar track record of implementing the recommendations of the Board of Auditors and was working with the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) to improve the implementation rate of its recommendations using a web-based tracking system.

3. She noted that JIU had compared accountability frameworks in the United Nations system and other international public institutions and had found that the Secretariat's framework included most of the key components. Nevertheless, strengthening accountability was a work in progress. In the area of results-based management, for example, the Secretariat was developing a methodology and implementation strategy appropriate to the unique environment of the United Nations. Recognizing that accountability was the cornerstone of an effective and trustworthy Organization, the Secretary-General would work with all stakeholders to identify areas that required further improvement.

4. **Mr. Kelapile** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/66/738), said that, while the Secretary-General's report (A/66/692) described the administrative policies, procedures and systems implemented or envisaged for the accountability framework, it provided few details that enabled a clear understanding of the underlying principles and mechanisms. It also lacked information on the weaknesses those measures were intended to address, the timetable for their implementation and the subsequent steps envisaged. The Advisory Committee therefore recommended that the Secretary-General should be requested to improve the content of future progress reports on the implementation of the accountability framework by providing more complete and transparent information, including an analysis of the impact of measures implemented, with key performance indicators and supporting statistical information.

5. The Advisory Committee welcomed the start-up of the "Accountability A to Z" portal as a reference tool to raise awareness of accountability issues. However, that was just a first step: exemplary leadership by senior management was critical in developing a strong culture of accountability, personal integrity, compliance and performance. Failure to hold senior managers to account would have a negative impact on setting accountability standards throughout the Organization.

6. The improvement in monitoring the implementation of the recommendations of the oversight bodies was also welcome. Prompt action to address the weaknesses identified by those bodies was integral to developing an effective accountability system; the Advisory Committee emphasized their

important role and encouraged the Secretary-General to strengthen consultation and cooperation with them.

7. While the Advisory Committee acknowledged the efforts made to review and revise the system of delegation of authority, it found that the Secretary-General's report contained insufficient information to enable a clear understanding of the review process and its findings or the functioning of the new system of delegation of authority and the intended improvements. It reiterated its recommendation that the Secretary-General should be requested to provide further details on the revised system, the mechanisms for monitoring the exercise of delegated authority and the measures to be taken in case of mismanagement or abuse of that authority.

8. Having noted the changes made to the content and assessment methods of the compact system, the Advisory Committee was of the view that, with the envisaged establishment of a connection between individual workplans, departmental workplans, budget fascicles and the senior managers' compacts, and the inclusion in those compacts of the final assessment of managers' performance, that system could become a powerful instrument of accountability. It encouraged the Secretary-General to put those measures into effect.

9. The Advisory Committee would comment further on the performance management policy and the reform of the performance appraisal system when it considered the Secretary-General's proposals on human resources management to be submitted to the General Assembly at its sixty-seventh session. A system of rewards and sanctions was essential to creating a culture of accountability; the Advisory Committee therefore recommended that the Secretary-General should be requested to assess and rigorously apply the measures in place for dealing with cases of underperformance and to report comprehensively on the matter in his report on human resources management issues.

10. With regard to the enterprise risk management framework, the Advisory Committee welcomed the progress made, including the definition of a policy on enterprise risk management and internal control and a methodology and tools for its implementation.

11. **Mr. Zahran** (Chair, Joint Inspection Unit), introducing the JIU report on accountability frameworks in the United Nations system (A/66/710), said that the objective had been to map out and assess the existing frameworks and identify gaps. Accountability practices adopted by organizations even in the absence of a formal framework had been evaluated to identify the components of accountability. The report stressed the complexity of the concept of accountability, which went beyond an internal control system or enterprise risk management process. Transparency and a culture of accountability were important underpinnings of every accountability framework. The report identified 5 principles and 17 benchmarks by which to measure the degree of accountability achieved. Although organizations were primarily responsible for assessment, Member States also bore some responsibility for oversight.

12. Seven United Nations organizations currently had formal accountability frameworks: the United Nations, the International Labour Organization (ILO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) and the World Health Organization (WHO). The frameworks of the United Nations, UNFPA and WHO failed to identify a culture of accountability as one of the pillars, while the United Nations, UNDP and UNICEF frameworks offered good examples of transparency and management responsibility for organizational accountability.

13. Further efforts were required to achieve a mature culture of accountability across the United Nations system. The consistent application of discipline and rewards was sorely needed; the United Nations in particular lacked a comprehensive system of incentives and sanctions. Above all, a culture of accountability would become fully developed only when senior managers led by example and held themselves publicly accountable.

14. Introducing the JIU report on transparency in the selection and appointment of senior managers in the United Nations Secretariat (A/66/380), he noted that the senior managers covered by the report were the Deputy Secretary-General, Under-Secretaries-General and Assistant Secretaries-General, as the appointment of managers at other levels had already been examined in previous JIU and OIOS reports. JIU had found that, while Member States had no major concerns with the structure of the selection and appointment process, they did have concerns about its implementation, which was seen as opaque. JIU recognized that the Secretary-General had discretion in making senior

management appointments, but agreed with Member States that that authority did not give him carte blanche to avoid the process he had established. A balance should be struck so that Member States received sufficient information to have confidence that the process was fair and transparent without compromising the privacy of the candidates or the confidentiality of the deliberative process, whether of the interview panels or the Secretary-General. JIU recommended that the General Assembly should direct the Executive Office of the Secretary-General to establish a dedicated website to convey specific information to the Assembly and that it should endorse the guidelines set out in the JIU report and direct the Secretary-General to follow them in tandem with the process outlined in his previous report on accountability (A/64/640).

15. The Secretary-General's comments on the present report, contained in document A/66/380/Add.1, offered no change or improvement to the process but rather attempted to justify its opacity. The many caveats made — reflected in such phrases as "when feasible", "as appropriate", "generally" and "as needed" — rendered meaningless the steps involved in implementing the process. JIU was disappointed by the Secretariat's "business-as-usual" approach and by the attempt to deflect attention away from the important issues raised by the inspectors, including the need to rationalize and streamline the number and titles of Under-Secretary-General and Assistant Secretary-General positions; the myriad other processes in place for making senior appointments; the failure to advertise or notify Member States of vacancies for senior field-based positions; and the need for proper vetting of candidates.

16. **Mr. Terzi** (Joint Inspection Unit), introducing the JIU report on the review of enterprise risk management in the United Nations system (A/65/788), said that enterprise risk management was an essential element of good governance and accountability. Based on a review of the literature and analysis of lessons learned, JIU had set out 10 benchmarks and 3 recommendations for the successful implementation of enterprise risk management in United Nations system organizations. It recommended that those organizations should adopt the first nine benchmarks, and while they had generally agreed, they had also expressed concern that lack of resources for the required software and training might hamper effective implementation.

17. JIU also recommended that the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB) should adopt the tenth benchmark, on closer inter-agency cooperation, coordination and knowledge-sharing networks and the management of cross-cutting organizational risks. Although differences in the structures and mandates of agencies required flexibility in the design and implementation of enterprise risk management policies, that should not prevent the adoption of a common policy approach, which would facilitate communication and collaboration to address risks across the system.

18. Enterprise risk management responded to the need of governing bodies and management to understand the risks that might affect the achievement of organizational objectives. JIU therefore recommended that those bodies should exercise their oversight role regarding the adoption of enterprise risk management benchmarks, effective implementation and the management of critical risks in their respective organizations. He urged the Committee to endorse the benchmarks in order to facilitate the coherent implementation of enterprise risk management in all United Nations system organizations.

19. **Mr. Issa** (Executive Office of the Secretary-General), introducing the note by the Secretary-General transmitting his comments on the JIU report on transparency in the selection and appointment of senior managers in the United Nations Secretariat (A/66/380/Add.1), said that the selection and appointment of senior managers was a complex process that required flexibility and discretion. In seeking the most suitable person for a particular position, the Secretary-General ensured the fairness and transparency of the process while protecting the privacy of candidates and panel members. The objective was to put in place a senior management team with high standards of efficiency, competence, integrity and accountability capable of directing the Organization to respond to evolving organizational needs in order to meet the expectations of Member States and other stakeholders. The Secretary-General's authority to achieve that objective as the Organization's chief administrative officer was enshrined in Article 97 of the Charter.

20. Merit was the core principle in the recruitment of senior staff. In considering candidates who met the core requirements of a post, the Secretary-General also considered other elements to ensure that the selected candidate was a good fit with the management team and that the selection decision enhanced the Organization's objectives. He was committed to ensuring equitable geographical distribution and gender representation.

21. The Secretary-General was mindful of the need to share information with Member States while protecting the confidentiality of the process. As he embarked on his second term, he was keen to ensure the right mix of change and continuity in his senior leadership team, the intention being to build a team with a diverse and complementary composition that was strong on substantive issues. The Secretary-General's firm commitment to mobility would be upheld through the application of the five-year rule across the board. In addition, he would seek to balance the need for fresh perspectives in addressing major challenges and the need to maintain continuity of purpose and priorities. Accordingly, nominations had been sought for Under-Secretaries-General for eight departments and offices: the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, the Department of Public Information, the Department of Political Affairs, the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, the Office for Disarmament Affairs, the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa, the Economic Commission for Africa and the Economic Commission for Europe. The positions had been advertised on the Secretary-General's website, on the Member States' portal and in such publications as *The Economist*, *Le Monde* and *Jeune Afrique*. Nominations were also being sought for Under-Secretaries-General for Management and for Field Support; nominations from Member States would be welcome.

22. The positions in the Office for Disarmament Affairs, the Economic Commission for Europe and the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa had been filled; the Secretary-General had also appointed the Deputy Secretary-General and Chef de Cabinet. He would make additional announcements in the following weeks as the relevant selection processes were completed.

23. **Mr. Herman** (United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination), introducing the note by the Secretary-General transmitting his comments and those of CEB on the JIU report on accountability frameworks in the United Nations system (A/66/710/Add.1), said that agencies generally supported the content and conclusions of the JIU report. They agreed that the substance of accountability frameworks was more important than their form and that what counted was a culture of accountability and the actual application of accountability in operation. While they generally accepted the spirit of the recommendations, they had some reservations: on the recommendation that called for the development of an information disclosure policy, for example, they suggested that such a policy should include safeguards to protect organizations' interests.

24. Turning to the note by the Secretary-General transmitting his comments and those of CEB on the JIU report on the review of enterprise risk management in the United Nations system (A/65/788/Add.1), he said that agencies recognized the importance of enterprise risk management and considered that a well-structured approach to risk could help them deliver on their mandates. They also agreed that a coordinated approach would be useful, as many were in the early stages of developing their enterprise risk management. While they generally accepted the JIU recommendations, they had concerns about several of the benchmarks. They noted that successful implementation of enterprise risk management required adequate funding and that it was a challenge to identify resources for a project of that magnitude in an environment of limited budgetary flexibility. Benchmark 10, which called for a harmonized approach, might prove difficult to achieve given the lack of homogeneity of agencies' mandates and operations.

25. Many organizations, with the benefit of JIU assessments of accountability, management and oversight in the United Nations system, had made efforts to strengthen and reorient their managerial cultures, management systems and accountability and oversight processes. In doing so, they were responding to the changing context in which they implemented their mandates and a scarcity of resources, which put pressure on public organizations worldwide to better use public funds and ensure higher-quality performance.

26. **Mr. Benmehidi** (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, expressed concern that the fundamental principles of accountability for international civil servants, as defined in General Assembly resolution 64/259, had not been fully upheld by the Organization's leadership. The Group, which had repeatedly underscored the need for the Secretary-General to lead by example, concurred with the Advisory Committee that his failure to hold senior managers to account had a negative impact on setting accountability standards throughout the Organization.

27. The Secretary-General's report (A/66/692) did not address the specific issues mentioned in the resolution and, while it described the accountability framework, provided few details on the accountability measures

themselves: information on mechanisms for monitoring and reporting on implementation should have been provided. Despite the assertion that accountability was being strengthened, the dearth of details, and the fact that performance reporting and results-based management were missing from the framework, indicated a lack of commitment to implementing an effective accountability system and fostering a culture of accountability throughout the Secretariat.

28. He expressed consternation at the many initiatives — such as the change management initiative — that were being implemented without a legislative mandate. The Group requested that, in order to build trust between the Member States and the Secretariat, the Secretary-General should submit his report on change management to the General Assembly under the agenda item on review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations.

29. In recent months, the Member States had witnessed rivalries among senior managers and attempts to usurp the intergovernmental process on issues that lay within the purview of the Assembly. The crisis that had faced the Umoja enterprise resource planning project for nearly 10 months was an example of a failure of accountability in the Organization; the Group called for a full review of its causes and circumstances.

30. As the implementation of an accountability system in the United Nations was an ongoing process, the Group endorsed the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the Secretary-General should be requested to submit an annual progress report on the matter.

31. **Mr. van den Akker** (Observer for the European Union), speaking also on behalf of the acceding country Croatia; the candidate countries Iceland, Macedonia, Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that the European Union welcomed the progress made in implementing an effective accountability system and the Secretary-General's efforts to promote a culture of accountability. It was disappointed, however, at the lack of in-depth analysis of the factors contributing to such a culture, including the role of leadership, a rigorous performance appraisal system, and a system of rewards and sanctions. It was also regrettable that the Advisory Committee's report on the subject (A/66/738) had been issued at a late stage.

32. A culture of accountability was crucial for the effective and transparent delivery of results and relied on mutual trust, cooperation, common objectives, reliable measurements, incentives and corrective action. Clear delegation of authority with well-defined roles and responsibilities was another prerequisite for success. The European Union wished to receive further information on the new system of delegation of authority and the improvement it was designed to yield.

33. Much remained to be done to mainstream a culture of accountability into the day-to-day functioning of the United Nations: setting good examples and linking institutional to personal accountability were part of that process. Senior managers should not only be vocal in their support of accountability but should also practise it by holding themselves to account. The results-based management system and other performance-related initiatives, bolstered by the work of the change management team, were setting the right parameters. However, his delegation was deeply concerned about the management and governance crisis in Umoja, which sent a contradictory message about the need for managers to be at the forefront of accountability.

34. A foundation had been laid for enterprise risk management, which should be streamlined throughout the Organization and become embedded in every function rather than being the responsibility of a centralized office.

35. **Mr. Dettling** (Switzerland), speaking also on behalf of Liechtenstein, said that applying the principle of accountability was crucial to ensure that the United Nations enjoyed credibility with its stakeholders. He welcomed the efforts to establish a system of accountability within the Secretariat, which was admittedly a complex task. However, he concurred with the Advisory Committee that the Secretary-General's report (A/66/692) should have contained more specific information on progress, with greater use of key performance indicators and statistical data.

36. The progress made in developing an enterprise risk management framework was welcome and the positive experience drawn from its implementation in the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and the capital master plan was encouraging. The two delegations would examine closely the proposal to establish a dedicated enterprise risk management and internal control function within the Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Management.

37. The Committee should be informed as soon as possible of progress in results-based management and performance reporting, which were key elements of accountability. He urged the Secretary-General to continue implementing accountability within the Secretariat and not to allow the process to become overly lengthy. Two questions should be answered to clarify the scope and timeframe of the remaining work: what was the objective in each area of the accountability system and what was the deadline for the full implementation of the system and the start of the monitoring phase?

Farewell to the Under-Secretary-General for Management

38. **The Chair**, on behalf of the Committee, joined by **Mr. Kelapile** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), **Mr. Zahran** (Chair, Joint Inspection Unit) and **Mr. Herman** (United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination), thanked Ms. Kane for her outstanding work as Under-Secretary-General for Management and wished her every success in her new post as High Representative for Disarmament Affairs.

39. **Ms. Kane** (Under-Secretary-General for Management) paid tribute to the hard-working and indefatigable nature of the members of the Fifth Committee. She hoped to receive an equally warm welcome when she appeared before them in her new capacity.

Agenda item 115: Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (*continued*)

(b) Appointment of members of the Committee on Contributions (*continued*) (A/66/102/Add.1)

40. **The Chair** drew the Committee's attention to document A/66/102/Add.1, in which the Secretary-General informed the General Assembly of the resignations of Mr. Sumi (Japan), with effect from 1 February 2012, and Mr. Park Hae-yun (Republic of Korea), with effect from 6 February 2012, from the Committee on Contributions. The Secretary-General invited the Assembly to appoint two persons to fill the remaining period of the terms of office of Mr. Sumi and Mr. Park Hae-yun, which expired on 31 December 2012 and 31 December 2014, respectively. In the same document, he communicated the names of two persons who had been nominated by their respective Governments to fill the remaining period of the terms of office. Both candidatures had been endorsed by the Group of Asia-Pacific States. He took it that the Committee wished to recommend by acclamation that the Assembly should confirm the candidates' appointment.

41. *It was so decided.*

42. *The Committee recommended that the Assembly should confirm the appointment of Mr. Watanabe (Japan) for a term beginning on the date of appointment and expiring on 31 December 2012, and of Mr. Yoo Dae-jong (Republic of Korea) for a term beginning on the day of appointment and expiring on 31 December 2014.*

(l) Appointment of members of the International Civil Service Commission (A/66/694)

43. **The Chair** drew the Committee's attention to document A/66/694, in which the Secretary-General, referring to articles 3 to 5 of the statute of the Commission, informed the Assembly that Mr. Paranhos Velloso (Brazil) had resigned from the Commission, effective 6 October 2011, and invited it to appoint a person to fill the remaining period of the term of office of Mr. Paranhos Velloso, which expired on 31 December 2013. In the same document, he communicated the name of a person who had been nominated by his Government to fill the vacancy arising from the resignation of Mr. Paranhos Velloso and whose candidature had been endorsed by the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States. He took it that the Committee wished to recommend by acclamation that the Assembly should confirm the candidate's appointment.

44. *It was so decided.*

45. *The Committee recommended that the Assembly should confirm the appointment of Mr. Hermosillo (Mexico) for a term beginning on the day of appointment and expiring on 31 December 2013.*

Other matters

46. **The Chair**, recalling that, at its 27th meeting held on 6 March 2012, the Committee had resumed its consideration of the conditions of service of judges under agenda item 134, Programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013, drew the Committee's attention to a letter dated 1 February 2012 from the President of the International Court of Justice to the President of the General Assembly, contained in document A/66/726.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.

United Nations A/C.5/66/SR.29

General Assembly
Sixty-sixth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
25 May 2012

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 29th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 15 March 2012, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Tommo Monthe ..... (Cameroon)
Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. Kelapile

Contents

Agenda item 134: Programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 (*continued*)

Standards of accommodation for air travel (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

12-26478 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Agenda item 134: Programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 (*continued*)

Standards of accommodation for air travel (*continued*) (A/66/676 and A/66/739)

1. **Mr. Sach** (Officer-in-Charge, Department of Management), introducing the report of the Secretary-General on proposals for a more effective and efficient utilization of resources for air travel (A/66/676), said that the report, submitted in response to a request made by the General Assembly in its resolution 65/268, was divided into eight sections. The first seven described recommended reform measures for air travel by United Nations officials; coordination on air travel matters across the United Nations system; the use of frequent flyer miles for official travel; the tracking of costs associated with commercial air travel; implementation of the Umoja travel module and the delegation of authority to grant exceptions to the standard of accommodation for air travel. The last section provided a summary of the Secretary-General's recommendations for consideration by the General Assembly.

2. The basis of the recommendations was an overall review of travel entitlements conducted by the Office of Human Resources Management. More specifically, with regard to frequent flyer miles, the Secretary-General recommended that the administrative instruction on official travel should be amended to include a provision instructing all staff of the United Nations not to use, for personal travel, any frequent flyer miles gained as a result of conducting official business on behalf of the Organization and encouraging the use of such frequent flyer miles for official travel.

3. The Secretariat had conducted a study assessing the possibility of establishing a formal system to use frequent flyer miles for official travel. The study had benchmarked the practices of the United Nations with those of other international organizations, certain Member States and the private sector, analysed travel expenditure in New York and Geneva and explored the potential for outsourcing the acquisition of air tickets in exchange for frequent flyer miles. Based on the results of the study, the report had concluded that introducing an institutional frequent flyer mile system would not be cost-effective, as no net savings would be achieved.

4. In respect of travel planning, the Secretary-General had introduced a process to ensure finalization of travel arrangements 16 days in advance. That step should result in the Organization purchasing more lower-cost advance air fares. An online booking tool would be brought into use in April 2012, though only some itineraries could be booked online; and most would still require manual booking and the involvement of qualified agents.

5. With regard to the standards of accommodation for air travel, the Secretary-General recommended that all consultants, individual contractors and meeting participants should be required to travel in economy class, with the exception of members of committees and panels. In addition, the payment of daily subsistence allowance for time spent in flight should be discontinued. Concerning alternatives to air travel, the Secretary-General recommended that programme managers should be required to certify that due consideration had been given to alternative methods of meeting, such as videoconferences. Environmental factors should also be given due consideration when determining the mode of travel, without increasing travel costs. Where possible, alternatives which would lead to lower greenhouse gas emissions, such as rail travel, should be encouraged.

6. The current route selection policy should be changed, to give priority to the most economical route rather than the most direct and economical route, unless to do so disproportionately extended travel time. The aim was to take advantage of alliances between airlines. It was also recommended that when official travel was combined with home leave, the standard of accommodation for the entire journey should be economy class.

7. The Secretary-General advised tightening the conditions under which travel in business class was authorized: the standard of accommodation for each leg of a journey should be determined independently, unless travel to the final destination was resumed or continued on the same day. Furthermore, the maximum connecting time that could be included as part of the total flying time should be reduced from four hours to two hours. It was recommended that the intermediate rest stops allowed after 16 hours of flying time should be eliminated.

8. Economy class should be the standard of accommodation for travel associated with learning and development activities, regardless of the flying time. Staff should also be encouraged to downgrade voluntarily where possible from a business class

entitlement to premium economy or economy class. It was further recommended that, if travellers chose the lump-sum option for home leave or family visit, choice of that option should entail foregoing the travel time entitlement, in other words, time not counted as annual leave. For the sake of streamlining administrative processes, the General Assembly was invited to approve the extension of the lump-sum option for travel on initial appointment, transfer and assignment.

9. With regard to the coordination of air travel matters across the United Nations system, the Inter-Agency Travel Network, which included the Secretariat, had explored the possibility of establishing global airline agreements and had found that such agreements were ultimately not cost-effective. However, United Nations organizations at a number of duty stations, including New York and Geneva, used their combined purchasing power to gain airline discounts. It had been found that the discounts negotiated for trips originating in North America or Europe could in fact be used for either point of origin and indeed for many other destinations. They thus constituted de facto global discounts.

10. In response to the request made by the General Assembly in paragraph 2 (a) of the annex to its resolution 65/268 for the establishment of a mechanism to track all costs associated with air travel, the Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts had reviewed the issue. The Umoja travel module had been designed to fulfil that function. As described in the third progress report of the Secretary-General on the enterprise resource planning project (A/66/381), the full implementation of Umoja was projected for 2015. The travel module was one of the most critical parts of the second phase of implementation, called Umoja Extension, and would be deployed in 2014.

11. Turning to the issue of delegation of authority to grant exceptions to the standard of accommodation for air travel, he recalled that the General Assembly, in its resolution 42/214, had given the Secretary-General the ability to allow first-class air travel on a case-by-case basis. That discretionary authority was delegated to the Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Management, and provided for consideration of a medical condition necessitating a certain level of comfort not available to the traveller under the regular entitlement; the normal standard of accommodation being unavailable; the trip involving an arduous journey; the traveller being considered an eminent person, such as a head of State or Government; or the traveller being considered a prominent international figure and being in a position of donating services free of charge to the Organization. The Administration had found those procedures sufficient and therefore had not proposed any changes to them.

12. **Mr. Kelapile** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/66/739), said it contained general observations and individual remarks on each of the Secretary-General's proposals. The Advisory Committee stressed that resources for official travel should be utilized judiciously. Before official travel was authorized, full account should be taken of its cost-effectiveness and the potential impact on productivity.

13. The Advisory Committee was not fully satisfied with the quality of the Secretary-General's report, which should have provided information on the effect of the proposed measures in terms of cost savings, potential impact on staff productivity, working hours lost or gained and effective mandate implementation. In that regard, the Advisory Committee suggested that, for any measures implemented, the Secretary-General should be requested to provide such information in an initial report to be presented to the General Assembly at its sixty-seventh session, and thereafter in further regular reports. The lack of sufficient detail in the Secretary-General's report had led the Advisory Committee to request significant additional information in order to assess the merits of each measure; that information was reflected in its report and had been taken into account in its conclusions and recommendations.

14. The Advisory Committee had noted that tracking of all air travel costs in the Secretariat was contingent on the implementation of Umoja, and in particular its travel module, to be deployed in 2014. It would further examine the issue of the delegation of authority for granting exceptions for first class travel in the context of the Secretary-General's biennial report on the standards of accommodation for air travel. With regard to procurement, it suggested that the Secretary-General should be requested to explore other cost-effective options for acquiring air travel services, taking into account the experiences of other organizations. The Advisory Committee noted that, in line with the request made by the General Assembly in its resolution 65/268, a comprehensive audit of all air travel activities and related practices was to be conducted by the Office of Internal Oversight Services, beginning in February 2012.

15. The Advisory Committee had raised the issue of interaction with other entities and staff, emphasizing the need for consultations with other United Nations system organizations that might be affected by any measures adopted. It had also recalled the importance attached by the General Assembly to constructive dialogue between staff and management and trusted that such dialogue would be ensured.

16. **Mr. Benmehidi** (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group had taken note of the Secretary-General's report and would be examining its recommendations. The late issuance of the report of the Advisory Committee was a matter of concern, as it had affected delegations' ability to carefully consider the issues at hand. The Organization's air travel requirements were connected with the implementation of its mandates, and must be governed by continued and enhanced accountability. Further efforts could also be made to harmonize air travel practices across the United Nations system. The Group looked forward to fruitful discussion of the issue, and recalled that policy formulation remained the exclusive domain of the General Assembly.

17. **Mr. Lieberman** (United States of America) said that the discussion of air travel policies was an opportunity to advance key parts of the agenda for reform, a goal that should be shared by all who ultimately aimed to strengthen the Organization. In their reports, both the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee had emphasized that resources for official travel should be used judiciously. He commended the Secretary-General's leadership in making recommendations to make expenditure on air travel — standing at $73 million — more efficient. The measures contained in the report should be implemented as soon as possible. United Nations personnel and Member States should set an appropriate example at a time when so many people around the world were facing economic hardship.

18. His delegation believed that technology should be used more extensively to hold meetings without incurring the high costs of air travel, though it also recognized that technology could not universally replace face-to-face meetings, which had added value. However, where travel was inevitable, the Organization's finite travel resources must be used more rationally and carefully.

19. The Secretary-General's report had revealed a number of disturbing facts that demonstrated the need for an alignment of the Organization's standards of accommodation for air travel with those of Member States. According to the report, each reservation was changed between three and five times before a ticket was issued, and daily subsistence allowance was payable to United Nations officials even while in flight. Those were just two egregious examples of unjustifiable practices that must be changed. In addition, the excessive, costly and wasteful use of business and first class travel should be curbed as a means of meeting the Organization's travel requirements at a lower cost. Member States too must make more responsible use of United Nations resources for official travel. Such practices as paying Member State representatives a daily subsistence allowance 40 per cent greater than the standard allowance must be scrutinized.

20. His delegation shared the concerns expressed by the Advisory Committee regarding the lack of transparent system-wide air travel data. In order to maximize savings, a comprehensive view of patterns of waste and abuse across the United Nations system was needed. While the assurances that Umoja would be operational in 2015 were encouraging, the Secretary-General was urged to find ways to track overall expenditure in the meantime.

21. **Ms. Sohn** Sung-Youn (Republic of Korea), recalling the Committee's frequent calls for the efficient use of resources at a time of economic crisis, said that her delegation supported the Secretary-General's recommendations on air travel, which were in line with his call to "do more with less" in the context of the United Nations reform initiative. In particular, her delegation welcomed the proposals to establish economy class as the standard accommodation for consultants, individual contractors and trainees, regardless of flight duration; to discontinue payment of in-flight daily subsistence allowance; and to instruct staff not to use frequent flyer miles accrued through official travel for personal travel. However, efforts to reduce air travel costs must not seriously hamper the productivity, effectiveness or morale of United Nations staff. A balanced approach that was acceptable to both staff and Member States was needed.

22. As the Advisory Committee had noted, the Secretary-General's report must contain more data, notably further analysis of the cost savings, impact on productivity and effective mandate implementation resulting from the proposed measures, in order to enable the Member States to reach decisions. In

addition, the air travel practices and travel standards of other comparable international organizations and of Member States representing different levels of economic development should be studied further.

23. **Mr. Onuma** (Japan) said that the efforts of the Secretariat to use resources for air travel in an effective and efficient manner were commendable. The measures proposed in the Secretary-General's report were another step in the right direction. His delegation welcomed the proposal to modify the conditions applying to the granting of travel in business class and wished to know whether additional steps could be taken in that regard. While recognizing that an extensive study had been conducted on the prospect of implementing a formal programme to manage the use of frequent flyer miles for official travel, he requested further clarification on the feasibility of such a measure. Japan was willing to share its own experience with the travel-related issues under consideration.

24. **Mr. Sach** (Officer-in-Charge, Department of Management) said that he appreciated the Advisory Committee's support for the proposals contained in the Secretary-General's report and would clarify any outstanding technical questions during the informal consultations. The Department of Management stood ready to launch any measures that were approved.

25. **Mr. Kelapile** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), in response to the comments made by the representative of Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Advisory Committee attached great importance to the timely issuances of its reports, but also believed that it was critical to present sufficient information to genuinely assist Member States in their decision-making process. While the Advisory Committee had needed additional time to gather appropriate information for the report at hand, it would continue to bear in mind the need for timely submission of its reports.

The meeting rose at 10.40 a.m.

United Nations A/C.5/66/SR.30

General Assembly
Sixty-sixth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
25 June 2012

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 30th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 2 April 2012, at 4.30 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Tommo Monthe ..... (Cameroon)
Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. Kelapile

Contents

Agenda item 140: Joint Inspection Unit (*continued*)

Agenda item 134: Programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 (*continued*)

Special subjects relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013

Agenda item 132: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Progress towards an accountability system in the United Nations Secretariat

Questions deferred for future consideration

Completion of the work of the Fifth Committee at the first part of the resumed sixty-sixth session of the General Assembly

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

12-27383 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 8.55 p.m.

Agenda item 140: Joint Inspection Unit (*continued*)

Draft resolution A/C.5/66/L.29: Joint Inspection Unit

1. *Draft resolution A/C.5/66/L.29 was adopted.*

Agenda item 134: Programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 (*continued*)

Special subjects relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 (A/C.5/66/L.31)

Draft resolution A/C.5/66/L.31: Special subjects relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013

2. **Ms. Lapointe** (Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services), with reference to section III of the draft resolution, said that the internal audit activities of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS)were conducted in accordance with Institute of Internal Auditors international standards for the professional practice of such auditing. The United Nations internal auditing services had adopted those standards, which required auditing entities to possess or obtain the requisite knowledge, skill or other competencies, including obtaining advice or assistance to perform all or part of any undertaking. OIOS regularly contracted for specialized skills, competencies and advice to supplement its own, and would need to do so for the proposed in-depth, technical construction audit for the capital master plan, as a result of the nature of that audit.

3. *Draft resolution A/C.5/66/L.31 was adopted.*

Agenda item 132: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Progress towards an accountability system in the United Nations Secretariat (A/C.5/66/L.30)

Draft resolution A/C.5/66/L.30: Progress towards an accountability system in the United Nations Secretariat

4. **Mr. Mihoubi** (Algeria), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the text was divided into two parts. Section I related to progress towards an accountability system, and section II related to change management initiatives. As the members of the Committee were well aware from their informal consultations, discussions on accountability had proceeded smoothly prior to the issuance of the report of the Secretary-General on progress towards an accountability system in the United Nations Secretariat (A/66/692). However, the report had changed the landscape, blurring the distinction between the areas within the purview of the General Assembly and those within the purview of the Secretary-General. The subsequent difficulties would have been avoided had the report confined itself to matters of internal management of the Secretariat. The draft resolution reflected the Group's belief in preserving the prerogatives of the Member States, which were represented at the current meeting and which determined the Organization's direction.

5. **Mr. Torsella** (United States of America) said that his delegation wished to propose an oral amendment to draft resolution A/C.5/66/L.30, in which the existing section II would be replaced with the following:

"*Reaffirming* its determination to strengthen further the role, capacity, effectiveness and efficiency of the United Nations, and thus improve its performance, in order to realize the full potential of the Organization, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and to respond more effectively to the needs of Member States and existing and new global challenges facing the United Nations in the twenty-first century;

1. *Welcomes* the initiative of the Secretary-General and the work of the Change Management Team and the Change Management Plan;

2. *Reaffirms* the role of the Fifth Committee in administrative and budgetary matters;

3. *Reaffirms* the role of the Secretary-General as Chief Administrative Officer of the Organisation;

4. *Encourages* the Secretary-General to engage closely with the General Assembly on his vision for a modem, efficient and accountable Secretariat;

5. *Notes* the Secretary-General's recognition that several recommendations will require close, in-depth consultations and direction from Member States;

6. *Requests* the Secretary-General to revert at the second resumed part of its sixty-sixth session with an analysis of the recommendations that fall within his purview and those that require Member State review and approval in line with the provisions of this resolution."

6. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the oral amendment to section II of draft resolution A/C.5/66/L.30 proposed by the representative of the United States of America.

7. **Ms. Rohrmann** (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the European Union in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the Member States of the European Union strongly supported, and commended to all Member States, the amendment proposed by the United States of America. Its wording offered a balanced reflection of the Committee's discussions of the matter and demonstrated the continued effort of a number of Member States, irrespective of regional or group affiliation, to achieve a compromise. The proposed amendment recognized the efforts of the Secretary-General and the concerns raised by some Member States in connection with change management. Furthermore, it safeguarded the prerogatives of the General Assembly and provided it with the opportunity to consider the proposals in the Secretary-General's Change Management Plan.

8. **Ms. Smith** (Norway), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that Norway strongly supported the amendment proposed by the United States of America. It reflected the Committee's discussions, clearly demonstrated a will to reach compromise in the interests of a consensus on an important issue, and balanced the concerns of all parties. It highlighted the role of the Member States while supporting the efforts of the Secretary-General to strengthen the Organization.

9. *At the request of the representative of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, a recorded vote was taken on the oral amendment to section II of draft resolution A/C.5/66/L.30 proposed by the representative of the United States of America.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Liberia, Mexico, Panama, Serbia, Ukraine

10. *The proposed amendment to section II of draft resolution A/C.5/66/L.30 was rejected by 88 votes to 47, with 5 abstentions.*

11. **Mr. Torsella** (United States of America) requested a division of draft resolution A/C.5/66/L.30 proposed by the representative of Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, with separate consideration of section II.

12. **Mr. Mihoubi** (Algeria), on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, **Mr. Di Luca** (Argentina), **Mr. Vargas** (Brazil), **Mr. Cumberbatch** (Cuba), **Mr. McLay** (New Zealand), **Mr. Rosales Díaz** (Nicaragua), and

Mr. Prokhorov (Russian Federation), speaking on a point of order, asked for clarification of the procedure to be followed in the current instance, and, in particular, clarification as to which rule of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly applied, as that would affect how the Member States expressed their views in the vote.

13. **The Chair** said that rule 129 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly allowed part of a proposal to be put to a separate vote, and it was that matter on which the Member States were being requested to vote.

14. *A recorded vote was taken on the motion for division concerning section II of draft resolution A/C.5/66/L.30 proposed by the representative of the United States of America.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Mexico, Panama, Serbia, Ukraine

15. *The motion for division concerning section II of the draft resolution was rejected by 91 votes to 48, with 4 abstentions.**

16. **Mr. Sheck** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia and New Zealand, requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

17. **Ms. Rohrmann** (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the European Union in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the Member States of the European Union regretted the absence of consensus on the agenda item under discussion, despite their own active engagement and great flexibility in pursuing such an outcome. However, they had made clear their position that the proposals made by the Change Management Team to the Secretary-General fell outside the scope of the discussion of an accountability system. The proposals were for internal consideration by the Secretary-General, who could revert to the General Assembly at a time he deemed appropriate after examining them. It was important to strengthen further the role, capacity, effectiveness, efficiency and performance of the Organization. The initiative of the Secretary-General, the work of the Change Management Team and the Change Management Plan were therefore welcome. The member States of the European Union had full confidence in the Secretary-General as the chief administrative officer of the Organization.

18. In a final attempt to achieve consensus, the delegations of the European Union member States had joined those of other like-minded countries in approaching the Group of 77 and China once again to

* The delegation of the Solomon Islands subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote against the motion for division concerning section II of the draft resolution.

propose compromise wording for inclusion in the draft resolution. The ultimate failure of the negotiations was not in the interests of the Organization. The member States of the European Union continued to support the Secretary-General's change management initiative, and above all to support effective multilateralism and more effective delivery of the Organization's mandates through innovation and change management. They remained deeply concerned about the Committee's working methods, the reluctance to compromise and the willingness of a group of Member States to exploit a numerical majority, jeopardizing the partnership among all Member States and the sustainability of the Organization. The member States of the European Union looked forward to discussing in depth the issue of those working methods at the retreat organized by the President of the General Assembly on 13 and 14 April 2012, and urged a redoubling of efforts at future sessions, keeping in mind what should be the common goal of all: to have an efficient Organization which effectively fulfilled its mandates. For all the reasons just explained, the member States of the European Union urged all countries, irrespective of their group or regional affiliation, to vote against the draft resolution contained in document A/C.5/66/L.30.

19. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/66/L.30 as a whole.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Mexico, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Serbia, Ukraine.

20. *Draft resolution A/C.5/66/L.30 as a whole was adopted by 93 votes to 47, with 5 abstentions.*

21. **Mr. Torsella** (United States of America) said that the Committee had missed an opportunity to strengthen the accountability framework of the Organization, and to make it more modern, efficient and transparent, and able to deliver better results through responsible stewardship of resources. Despite the common ground between Member States on a number of important aspects of accountability, many had taken regrettable action to hinder the progress of the Secretary-General's change management initiative before it had begun, despite the fact that — as had already been pointed out — it was not even on the agenda for the session. That could undermine the authority which the Charter conferred on the Secretary-General as chief administrative officer of the Organization, affecting current and future holders of that office. His delegation strongly supported the Secretary-General's vision for a modern, engaged and efficient Secretariat; commended the collegial spirit in which he had shared his internal Change Management Plan with the Member States, and valued his commitment to building relationships based on mutual trust, greater flexibility and accountability, as outlined in the Plan.

22. The United States delegation trusted that the Secretary-General, like his predecessors, would consult with Member States if their approval was required, and noted that the Committee would have ample opportunity to assert its prerogatives on specific initiatives. It therefore strongly objected to, and had voted against, the draft resolution proposed by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, which eroded accountability and weakened the Secretary-General's ability to advance important management reforms by attempting to delay his implementation of approximately half of all the recommendations of his Change Management Team. Two examples illustrated the resolution's overreach. Recommendation 40 urged the Secretary-General to direct his own senior managers to fly economy class for travel of less than six hours on one continent. Recommendation 28 urged him, through the Deputy Secretary-General, to keep legislative bodies and other partners well informed as the working groups on cost recovery and programme support costs concluded their work. It was to be supposed that the Committee was one of those very legislative bodies. His delegation's objection was not just substantive, but also procedural. Following the proposal to put the draft resolution to the vote, his delegation had been compelled to submit an amendment because some Member States had not sought the broadest possible agreement on the matter, departing from the long-standing principle of consensus-based decision-making in the Committee by including provisions that a significant number of delegations clearly opposed. That did not correspond to any definition of consensus, the principle which underpinned the legitimacy of the Committee's decision making.

23. **Mr. Okochi** (Japan) said that, while his delegation appreciated the efforts of the Member States and the Chair to secure a consensus on the draft resolution just adopted, it had voted against it. Having listened to the concerns of a group of Member States, it had joined other delegations in proposing wording by which the General Assembly would have requested the Secretary-General to present an analysis of the recommendations in the report of the Change Management Team to the Committee at the second part of the resumed sixty-sixth session. It was concerned that the draft resolution had been put to a vote despite the flexibility shown by Japan. Recalling the guidance on consensus-based decision-making provided in General Assembly resolution 41/213, he hoped to see a more constructive approach at the next part of the resumed session. Lastly, Japan reiterated its support for the Secretary-General's initiative to implement the measures in the report of the Change Management Team.

24. **Mr. Yoo** Dae Jong (Republic of Korea) said that his delegation had much appreciated the guidance and conciliation efforts made by the Chair in the final days of the first part of the resumed sixty-sixth session, particularly in the form of the balanced and forward-looking texts on accountability, the capital master plan and the Office of Internal Oversight Services proposed prior to the current meeting. As those matters had an effect on the efficient management of the Secretariat, it was understandable that the Member State delegations had worked long hours and altered the schedule for completion of their discussions. Despite the earlier hope that agreement was near, it was disappointing that the Committee had resorted to voting on the draft resolution regarding accountability rather than taking a decision by consensus. His delegation had felt obliged to vote against the draft resolution, believing that responsibility and accountability went hand-in-hand with flexibility and discretion.

25. **Mr. McLay** (New Zealand), speaking also on behalf of Australia and Canada, said that the three delegations joined others in expressing their deep disappointment. As the Chair's efforts in the run-up to the current meeting had demonstrated, a consensus had been within reach, and Australia, Canada and New Zealand had been prepared to take up the consensus proposal, even though it did not meet their own needs. It was unfortunate that others had not been prepared to do the same. The three delegations had indicated from the very beginning of the Committee's discussion on accountability that they considered the report of the Change Management Team to be an internal document of the United Nations Secretariat and therefore found the inclusion of wording relating to that report in a draft resolution on the agenda item concerned entirely inappropriate. It was not for the Committee to micromanage the Secretariat or to prejudge the views of the Secretary-General or limit his authority. They reiterated their full confidence and trust in the Secretary-General and in his determination to deliver on his reform agenda with the support of Member States, seeking approval from the General Assembly when such approval was required or was appropriate. It was not appropriate to instruct him to take no action on

matters that were clearly within the authority given to him by the Charter of the United Nations. It was not appropriate to question his authority, or to challenge confidence and trust in him, at the current time, in the current venue or in connection with the current issue. The three delegations remained determined to carry forward the essential work of the Committee and to work constructively with all delegations to that end, positively and in good faith. They remained committed to supporting the Secretary-General's reform agenda and to making the Organization more accountable, transparent and efficient.

26. **Mr. Gürber** (Switzerland) said that his delegation regretted that intense discussions on the draft resolution just adopted had failed to produce a consensus. Reaching decisions by vote went against the spirit of the Committee. A resolution on an issue of such significance to the future management of the Organization should not have been imposed through a vote. Switzerland fully supported efforts to put in place an accountability system, and believed that the Secretary-General must be given a sufficient margin of initiative if he was to develop solid reform proposals to submit to the Member States and make sure that the Organization was strong, efficient and modern. The resolution adopted was clearly unsatisfactory from that standpoint, and Switzerland had therefore voted against it.

27. **Ms. Smith** (Norway) said that the work of the Committee should be guided by consensus as a matter of principle. Her delegation was deeply disappointed at the recourse to a vote on the matter under discussion, having taken consensus as its aim and having demonstrated great flexibility. Consensus had been within the Committee's reach, but the vote had been forced upon it. An amendment presented in a spirit of compromise had been rejected, and her delegation had found itself unable to vote in favour of the resulting draft.

28. **Mr. Cumberbatch** (Cuba) said that the outcome of the votes taken on the issues under consideration had been clear. Despite the repeated assertions of a number of delegations, the proposals of the Change Management Team did in fact fall within the scope of the agenda item, a fact confirmed by the Secretariat when it disregarded clear results-based management mandates contained in General Assembly resolution 64/269 on cross-cutting issues. The change management proposals were in essence a unilateral vision of the way in which the Organization should operate. A number of delegations had been quick to endorse those proposals, but nobody had asked the views of his delegation. Although it was claimed that the Group of 77 and China should take the blame for being unwilling to compromise, innumerable alternative forms of wording had been put forward during almost five weeks of discussion. The result reached at the current meeting was only a reflection of the fact that, contrary to the claim made in the note by the Secretary-General of 14 March 2012, the change management proposals did not enjoy wide support. It would have been far preferable for the Secretary-General to have abided by his role and mandate, and for the process to have been more transparent. Withholding the report of the Change Management Team from the Member States during budget discussions, only to see it made public later by a major United States media outlet, was not an exercise in transparency.

29. The recommendations in the report of the Change Management Team, including those purporting to mark the revival of a review of mandates and reform of the Secretariat, and affecting the role of the Committee for Programme and Coordination, were simply unacceptable. It was striking that delegations that had called for a vote on programme budget proposals in the past were currently citing a need for consensus. It was also striking that others, when it suited them, had used internal documents to support their views on the conduct of peacekeeping operations. More sincerity and less double standards would be welcome. He hoped that the Secretary-General and his officials would return to the neutral position ordered by the Charter of the United Nations, and would implement the resolution in the form in which it had been adopted. Finally, he wished to express concern at the way in which the voting machine had functioned at such a sensitive time.

30. **Mr. Rosales Díaz** (Nicaragua) said that he wished to congratulate the new Under-Secretary-General, Chef de Cabinet to the Secretary-General. The debate and difficulties surrounding the current meeting demonstrated that she had substantial challenges ahead of her. The Secretariat had an important role in building trust between itself and the Member States and between the Member States in the General Assembly. During the first part of the resumed sixty-sixth session, the Group of 77 and China had spared no

effort to find a consensus. It had faced a lack of political will, a lack of flexibility and arrogance in the form of repeated statements that the members of the Group must align their position with that of the other participants in the negotiations for the sake of consensus. The Group believed that flexibility was a two-way process, but had found a lack of understanding of that principle during the Committee's consultations.

31. He wondered why the very Member States which currently insisted that change management was not part of the Committee's agenda had endorsed the report of the Change Management Team at the Committee's 26th meeting, the first of the resumed session. Clearly, the wide support which the Secretary-General had announced when he presented the report to the Member States did not in fact exist. The result had been deep concern, misunderstanding, division and mistrust. Overcoming those problems required learning to listen to each other rather than repeating assertions and arguments that only frustrated proceedings rather than promoting agreement. He hoped that all concerned would learn from recent experience. It was impossible to impose on the General Assembly fundamental changes to the intergovernmental process or to processes that formed an integral part of its prerogatives. The Secretariat must redouble its efforts to address the environment of distrust that had emerged, and must demonstrate thorough understanding of the intergovernmental machinery, something which it had not done at the close of the main part of the sixty-sixth session, when some delegations had proposed politicized wording that the Committee had left out of the draft resolution adopted. Surprisingly, that politicized wording had reappeared in the report of the Secretary-General on change management. Such occurrences were suspicious and did not encourage trust, either between the Member States, or between the Member States and the Secretariat.

32. As a Main Committee of the General Assembly, the Fifth Committee made decisions which enjoyed a legitimacy conferred by the Charter of the United Nations. The process of making those decisions was governed by the Charter itself, the Organization's founding principle of sovereign equality of States and by the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. No purpose was served by preaching the benefits of democratic principles, which all Member States defended, while simultaneously failing to uphold those principles in the General Assembly. Such double standards were unacceptable. Surprisingly, the delegations which were so vociferous in their calls for a consensus had been unwilling to accept the second preambular paragraph of section II of the resolution, which, in recalling General Assembly resolution 41/213, reaffirmed the need to seek the widest possible agreement in the Committee. The challenge before the Committee was to restore the spirit of dialogue and understanding of the concerns of all parties. He hoped that the Secretariat would help with that task.

33. **Mr. Mihoubi** (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group was committed to reform of the Organization, to accountability and to transparency. Work with its partners to agree on the wording of section I of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.5/66/L.30 had proceeded smoothly. Any suggestion that the group opposed accountability was entirely unfounded. With regard to the conduct of the negotiations, the Group had found its partners unresponsive to proposals from the outset. Had they responded favourably, the Committee would have been able to take its decision without voting. The Group had continued to propose alternative wording until the very last moment, only to find its proposals rejected. As a result, any suggestion that the group opposed decision-making by consensus was also without basis.

Questions deferred for future consideration
(A/C.5/66/L.32)

Draft decision A/C.5/66/L.32. Questions deferred for future consideration

34. *Draft decision A/C.5/66/L.32 was adopted.*

Completion of the work of the Fifth Committee at the first part of the resumed sixty-sixth session of the General Assembly

35. **Mr. Torsella** (United States of America) said that, after long and arduous negotiations and failure to reach agreement on important items on the Committee's agenda, his delegation was disappointed with the overall outcome of the first part of the resumed sixty-sixth session. However, it was encouraged by the unity in the Committee, expressed in the draft resolution contained in document A/C.5/66/L.31, regarding the worrying cost overruns in the capital master plan

which, according to the Secretariat, had tripled since December 2011 to $265 million, not including associated costs. Action must be taken to determine how and when those cost overruns had occurred and how they would be mitigated by the Secretary-General, who had been given authority by the General Assembly to commit only a limited additional amount in the current year, and who had been asked to find additional options to finance such commitments while remaining within the budget approved. His delegation looked forward to the results of the external technical construction audit as a first step in assigning responsibility and recovering expenditure, and called on the Secretary-General to seek savings rather than simply assuming that additional assessments could be requested to complete the project. Stricter oversight was required. His delegation's support for the capital master plan was conditional on significantly improved management and budget discipline. It called for more frequent updates on the progress and financial details of the project.

36. Although the Committee had also reached agreement on a few important issues, including limited budgetary discretion for the Secretary-General, it had failed to reach agreement on, and had deferred consideration of, a number of others. In connection with standards of accommodation for air travel, despite learning that an astonishing $54 million of the Secretariat's $74 million expenditure on air travel for New York and Geneva had been devoted to paying business class fares, the Member States had been unable to agree even on a change that was so clearly a matter of common sense: requiring the Organization's interns to fly in economy class. That was a troubling reflection on the Committee's ability to fulfil its basic oversight responsibilities. In connection with the prospect of improving the transparency and accountability of the Organization by making available for public viewing the audit reports of the Office of Internal Oversight Services, the resistance of some Member States to such a measure was ironic at a time when many had professed their commitment to the principles of open government. Citizens had a right to see whether revenue from their taxes was being wisely spent. He questioned whether any member of the Committee could seriously consider informing a journalist or researcher from his or her own country that, unlike the Committee, they were not entitled to read such reports. For the second successive session, the General Assembly had failed to take action on that proposal. That inaction was a source of disappointment, not for the United States delegation, but for the Organization. He urged all Member States which professed to support transparency to declare their positions on that simple and long-overdue reform.

37. **Mr. Desta** (Eritrea) thanked the Chair, the Bureau, the coordinators of informal consultations and the staff of the Secretariat for their assistance during the first part of the resumed session. However, for the third consecutive year, his delegation wished to reiterate its concern at the many difficulties facing the Committee, two of which were particularly significant. The first was the late submission of documents. The second was the lack of political will to work for consensus. He intended to elaborate on that matter during the retreat organized by the President of the General Assembly on 13 and 14 April 2012, but wished to stress that the Committee could only succeed if its members worked together. Not the least of the consequences of such an approach would be the elimination of long hours of exhausting negotiation.

38. **The Chair** declared that the Fifth Committee had completed its work at the first part of the resumed sixty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 10.35 p.m.